

# ***SCAAC Meeting Summary and Minutes***

## ***(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)***

April 23, 2004  
Auditorium, Ground Floor  
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

### **Committee Members:**

|                      |                 |                          |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Margie T. Bradford   | Eleanor Mills   | Roxie R. Tempus          |
| Kay Freeland         | Henry Ormsby    | J. Maynard Thomas, Vice- |
| Suzanne Guyer        | Roger Pankratz  | Chairman                 |
| Varetta D. Hurt      | Robert Sexton   |                          |
| Benny Lile, Chairman | Linda Sheffield |                          |
| Gary Mielcarek       | H. M. Snodgrass | Three (3) Open Positions |

## **SCAAC Agenda**

|           | <b>Agenda Items</b>  | <b>Presenters</b>                      |
|-----------|--|--|
|           | <b>Call to Order</b>   | <b>Benny Lile</b>                      |
| <b>1.</b> | <b>Roll Call</b>   | <b>Roger Ervin</b>                     |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>Approval of Minutes from March 19, 2004</b>   | <b>Benny Lile</b>                      |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>GED Issue</b>   | <b>Benny Lile</b>                      |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Writing Portfolio</b>   | <b>Cherry Boyles<br/>Saundra Hamon</b> |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Informational Update on April 2004 KBE Action regarding Assessment &amp; Accountability Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 703 KAR 5:040</li> <li>b. Reward Strategies</li> <li>c. Longitudinal Assessment</li> <li>d. Shaping Kentucky's Assessment &amp; Accountability Program, School Year 2006-2007 and Beyond</li> <li>e. Greater Assistance to Teachers</li> </ul> | <b>Scott Trimble</b>                   |

|                    |  |                                       |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>6.</b>          | <b>High School Assessment</b>  | <b>Gene Wilhoit<br/>Scott Trimble</b> |
| <b>7.</b>          | <b>Curriculum Coverage and Number of Test Forms</b>  | <b>Scott Trimble</b>                  |
| <b>8.</b>          | <b>Discussion on April 2004 KBE Actions Regarding<br/>Assessment &amp; Accountability Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Shaping Kentucky's Assessment &amp;<br/>Accountability Program, School Year 2006-2007<br/>and Beyond</b></li> <li><b>b. End-of-Course Exams</b></li> <li><b>c. Snapshot Assessments</b></li> </ul> | <b>Benny Lile</b>                     |
| <b>Adjournment</b> |  |                                       |

**Presenters:**

Cindy Owen, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education  
Scott Trimble, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education  
Gene Wilhoit, Commissioner, Kentucky Department of Education

**In Attendance:**

CTB McGraw-Hill: Tammy Bullock  
Kentucky Department of Education: Bonnie Brinly, Robin Chandler, Linda France, Bill Insko, Starr Lewis, Linda Pittenger, Robin Thompson  
Kentucky Education Association (KEA): Sharon Felty Comer  
Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability: Gerald Lunney, Marcia Seiler  
Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence: Cindy Heine

|                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Call to Order</b> | <b>Benny Lile</b> |
|----------------------|-------------------|

Chairperson Benny Lile called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. He welcomed everyone and asked for the member roll call.

|                     |                    |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| <b>1. Roll Call</b> | <b>Roger Ervin</b> |
|---------------------|--------------------|

The membership roll was called with the following eleven members present:

Kay Freeland  
Suzanne Guyer  
Varetta D. Hurt  
Benny Lile

Gary Mielcarek  
Eleanor Mills  
Henry Ormsby  
Robert Sexton

H. M. Snodgrass  
Roxie R. Tempus  
J. Maynard Thomas

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| <b>2. Approval of Minutes from March 19, 2004 Meeting</b> | <b>Benny Lile</b> |
|---|-------------------|

**SCAAC member comments:**

Benny Lile presented to the committee members the meeting summary and minutes from the March 19, 2004 committee meeting and asked members to review.

**SCAAC MOTION**

Roxie Tempus made the motion that the minutes stand approved as presented. Suzanne Guyer seconded the motion. All members in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). The motion carries and the minutes are approved.

**SCAAC member comments:**

Benny Lile then dealt with some housekeeping issues. Discussion of Writing Portfolio, agenda item number 4, will start after 11:00 a.m. to allow participation of some Kentucky Department of Education staff that are then available. If committee members are agreeable High School Assessment, agenda item 6, can be shifted up in agenda to

where Writing Portfolio was. There were no questions or opposition from committee members to change the schedule.

Benny Lile then referenced the email that he sent to committee members. Benny Lile then spoke to the Appointment issue. In House Bill 53 (1998) that created SCAAC, the law calls for seven (7) people to have initial appointments for a four (4) year term and the other members a two (2) year appointment. After that there would only be two (2) year terms, and members could only be appointed to serve two (2) consecutive terms. Those of us who have appointments that are now ending have already been on the council for two (2) terms. It appears that our terms will be ending. If the Governor's Office sticks to the timetable new appointments should be active in May 2004. If nothing happens over the next month or so, we may be back together and we should stay on our meeting schedule. We are going to be working through those issues over the next month. The last thing Benny Lile wanted to happen is for the committee members to leave the meeting today with nothing being acknowledged about their committee service. At this point the committee members know as much as Benny Lile knows. As soon as information is available it will be forwarded to committee members.

### **3. GED Issue**

**Scott Trimble**

#### *KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble provided the committee with background history in Kentucky with the GED (General Educational Development) test prior to the passage of House Bill 178. Kentucky's dropout rate is not consistent with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition. In 1992 Kentucky was consistent with the NCES standard. There was some concern expressed about our definition of dropout rate. From a historical prospective, in the 1990-92 time frame, Kentucky was consistent with NCES dropout definition. What the dropout definition said if you are a student that transfers from a secondary school, to another educational setting, graduates from high school or dies are the three conditions that the student is not a dropout. NCES defines a secondary school as a school with grades 7 to 12. This is the definition used through the last reporting cycle.

Two dimensions have been added to the definition. One is that it makes clear that a student who transfers from a secondary school setting to a secondary GED program should not be counted as a dropout. That provision was in the 1992 NCES definition but no one could define what a secondary GED program was. Kentucky has never been approved by Washington for secondary GED programs.

The second provision added is that if a student drops out school and gets a GED by October 1 of the following fall, then that student is no longer considered a dropout. House Bill 178 adopts the NCES definition and adds the caveat that the student has to be enrolled in the school for 30 days before the student can be considered as a dropout against the school. All students will be rolled up and counted in the State dropout rate. The enrolled requirement of 30 days does not apply in the state dropout calculation. This will affect how Kentucky captures drop out statistics.

At this time the State Board has not ruled on the regulation in regards to GED and dropouts.

Linda France advised that the state board subcommittee will recommend to the full board that the law in effect be approved and implemented.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked if Kentucky Department of Education staff (KDE) will be charged with writing a regulation around the law and what is the action requested of this committee?

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen felt that it may not be necessary to write or modify a regulation.

Linda France advised that KDE will have to define a district approved program and state approved GED completion program. This is where the definition of dropout will occur. Students must be enrolled in a secondary GED program or successfully complete a GED program by October 1.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile and H.M. Snodgrass confirmed that any student who drops out are put on hold and if they are not participating in a secondary GED program or have successfully completed a GED program by October 1, then they are considered a drop out.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France understands that there are two kinds of programs. The GED program that is currently in place. What is not in place in Kentucky is an approved secondary GED program that could take place at the high school level or as an extension of a high school program. There is one program operating in Jefferson County that is similar to what will be developed. There is strict criteria built around who goes into the program. While the student is in the program the school would collect ADA for the education of the student.

Scott Trimble added that while the student is enrolled in the secondary GED program, the student would be required to participate in all state assessments.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked for a clarification that the law does not have an affect Kentucky's dropout rate.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble indicated that it currently does not have an affect but in the future it will. Students will not be considered a dropout if the student is in a secondary GED program which has no time restrictions or obtains a GED by October 1. The student also has to be enrolled in the school for 30 days to be considered in the school's dropout calculations.

Linda France added that in the secondary GED program that while there are no time limits the student still must show successful improvement.

SCAAC member comments:

Roxie Tempus is concerned that requiring students in secondary GED programs to take state assessments will have a negative impact on schools which may cause schools to direct students away from the program who could most benefit. Roxie also inquired about age requirements for the GED.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France responded that there is an age requirement.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland provided the details that the student's class must have graduated and the student must have had to drop out of school for a year. There are extenuating circumstances. There is list of 5 reasons that permits the student to take the GED. The student must have the approval of the Local Educational Agency Superintendent under the old way. This is the current law.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France responded that the State Board will have to wrestle with these issues.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked if there are any plans to raise the age of quitting school from age 16 to 18?

KDE staff comments:

Linda France responded that this comes up in proposed legislation about once a year. There has been a lot of discussion about raising the age to 18 and there are a lot of pros and cons. Linda's feelings as a former superintendent are that this would require more staff and more programs to work with these students.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby advised that this was a legislative priority for Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). Unfortunately it has gone nowhere.

H. M. Snodgrass indicated that the statute brings Kentucky inline with the NCES standard. Overall not many students are affected but this will provide the option to help

the key students who would have just dropped out. As the State Board moves forward the Legislature will address the whole situation again.

Kay Freeland said that in her district those who are affected are high school students with 2 or 3 credits and are already 16 years of age. They are looking at 3 more years before graduation. The GED test is much tougher than 4 years ago and Kay would hate to target these students with just JCPS curriculum.

Kay Freeland shared that the GED program that JCPS has developed is a self-paced program designed for their alternative schools.

*KDE staff comments:*

Linda France said that the JCPS in school program has the students addressing core studies in the morning and work study in the afternoon.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Benny Lile advised the committee that there is no action required by this committee. The discussion was designed to inform the committee as the legislation has just been passed. The State Board took it up for the first time at their last meeting.

H. M. Snodgrass feels that districts are there to provide education and learning. Kentucky's current drop out rate is in the range of 5 or 6%. Only students who are considering dropping out should be allowed to enroll in the secondary GED program. The enrollment should never exceed is 5 to 6%.

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble brought to the committee's attention that dropout statistics also affect graduation rate used in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) calculations. Currently there is a debate between Kentucky and USDOE over whether this is an acceptable practice. We do not know the outcome at this time as USDOE may not accept National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) definition of dropout rate.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Maynard Thomas is concerned about districts that exceed the state dropout rate averages. Some districts have dropout rates as high as 10%.

*KDE staff comments:*

Linda France indicated that KDE is making all efforts to work with these districts to keep students in school and reduce that rate. Linda feels that the State Board wants to recognize these students as obtaining a GED and not counting them as graduates. The State Board wants to continue the incentive to keep the graduation rate high. This is no attempt to move students into a dropout program.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney felt that since these students will not count in the graduation rate, it is a disincentive for schools to place students in this program.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked for explanation on the impact on taking CATS results in having these students assessed on the state assessment.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble personally does have a concern as this is a positive part of the legislation. The school is moving the student into a program where the student is not considered a dropout. It also causes the school to do the best they can with that student because the students CATS scores count in the accountability calculations.

OEA staff comments:

Marcia Seiler feels that the concern is the alignment or requirement for GED different than for CATS. Are we putting a burden on the teacher to teach two separate curriculums. You may be setting the teacher up for a difficult situation to prepare the student for the current assessment that they will be taking versus the true end goal that GED represents.

SCAAC member comments:

Varetta Hurt has military people come and speak to her classes and say the GED is not recognized as much as a high school diploma. How do employers feel?

OEA staff comments:

Marcia Seiler advised that the Kentucky High School Athletic Association has course requirements for athletes; what courses they must take and what grade point they must maintain.

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>6. High School Assessment</b> | <b>Gene Wilhoit<br/>and<br/>Scott Trimble</b> |
|----------------------------------|---|

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile handed out to committee members a document from Linda Sheffield. Linda could not be here today and she asked Benny to share her thoughts on High School Assessment. Benny indicated that assessment and reform have moved in a positive direction elementary schools, middle schools to some degree and high schools to a lesser degree. High schools remain the greatest challenge in many different respects.



KDE staff comments:

Commissioner Gene Wilhoit could not talk about High School Assessment out of the context of the broader issues around high school. It does appear in terms of assessment issues, there are some identifiable issues that people are struggling with. The promise found in the first RFP after the 1998 revisions promised that some means to assess student preparedness in career technical education areas. It was included in the RFP but appropriate mechanism could not be found to carry it out. Second, the Writing Portfolio has a broader issue with the senior piece and whether it is appropriately grounded in the context that students find meaningful and the product of that endeavor is useful beyond the grading of it. Third, the high school is different as we begin to restructure ourselves. There have been some conversations about the overload at a level. All of the changes were made because of the fields' request to do so. It has emerged as a problem; the desperately in curricular offerings and instructional results in the state. We need to think about other patterns of assessment. Would it be appropriate for us to think about end of course exams as a means for students, in an incremental way, to demonstrate points of learning? For these to come about the committee needs to consider changes to the secondary curriculum. We will be coming forward with a conceptual piece on the redesign of the high school curriculum in the next couple of months. This committee will have the opportunity to review. Commissioner Wilhoit wanted the committee to provide some thoughts on where we are headed.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton indicated that there is a growing concern here and around the country about lack of improvement in high school achievement. We need to maintain the continuity of system. Robert sent committee members a research article on accountability that seems to indicate that it is not having an impact on high schools because of the different nature of high schools. Robert cited a multitude of reasons for this. Maybe the first priority is to put a moratorium on CATS at the high school level.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit indicated that continuity is not the only factor to cause us to go to our experts and ask the question about continuity. We ought to be making the best judgments that we can about what will drive excellence in teaching and learning. Then we can look at the affects on the accountability system. At some point we will have another dotted line that we have made some adjustments system. Any good system plan will force us to make those decisions from time to time. We need to begin immediately to begin those discussions as our current contract expires after the 2006 assessment. We need to make decisions over the next 6 to 8 months.

We do not know what a high school should look like but we know that they can not look like what they look like today. They are out of sync with the expectations of today's society. The mandate is to bring all children to the level competency and in Kentucky we have decided that competency level is beyond mere existence. The goal is preparing a workforce at least those midlevel occupations that are going to exist in the future. We can not back off on the goals we have. This requires a rigorous curriculum.

This also requires students having much more responsibility and accountability in the junior and senior years.

SCAAC member comments:

H.M. Snodgrass feels that if we do not rethink evaluation at high school level, we are restricting learning and limiting the preparation of students for the workforce. The current assessment process needs to be rethought.

Henry Ormsby advises that he is having a problem understanding the issue. If our elementary and middle schools are all doing well and our tests are working well, those are the children that are now in high school. What is wrong? Henry is really interested in the learning environment. Before you can fix something, you need to understand what the problem is.

Benny Lile said that it deals with alignment issues. Every fourth grader has science before they take the test. Students have had science each year before they again take the test in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. Every 8<sup>th</sup> grader has had mathematics for eight years and have had it right up to when they take the test. Students begin to focus at the high school. Linda Sheffield in many previous meetings has raised the concern about the alignment of mathematics between our core content, our program of studies, national standards, work place standards, and Council of Post Secondary P-16. Benny Lile has an added interest in teacher assigned grades where an “A” in an algebra class in one school can be significantly different in another school. Standard end of course exams across the state could assist in better understanding student learning and proper assignment of grades. There is a myriad of issues surrounding this high school topic.

KDE staff comments:

Gene Wilhoit’s impression is that it is not a simple matter of students not taking the test seriously nor wanting to pass the test. We have multiple indicators that point to a problem. Mathematics remediation rates at colleges and universities have very close alignment with our studies and ACT results This alignment is better than grades students receive. The core problem is that we are not getting the motivation and the skill and knowledge level out of the 12<sup>th</sup> year of student education. The assessment is pointing out the more severe problems. Evidence shows that the assessment system is not driving improvements at high school level through the current assessment system.

SCAAC member comments:

Roxie Tempus is a strong proponent of assessment and CATS testing. She is much more concerned about students taking a curriculum that gets them ready for college. There needs to be different ways to assess our high school students.

H. M. Snodgrass asks member to recall from the last meeting that NTAPAA members confirmed that our curriculum is a mile wide and an inch deep. This magnifies itself even more at the high school level in what we are asking schools to accomplish.

Robert Sexton asked that the committee have recommendations for the State Board and made the following motion.

### **SCAAC MOTION**

The parts of the document relevant to high schools, the paragraphs relevant to high schools be transmitted from this body to the state board of education as our recommendation.

Kay Freeland seconded the motion.

Benny Lile read the text of the e-mail relevant to high schools.

#### **High School Reform**

The lack of movement in high school student achievement is an issue across the nation. This is evidenced by the TIMSS study, NAEP scores and college remediation rates. The last five years have seen the publication of numerous national reports recommending improvement at the high school level. Several high profile individuals and organizations are currently bringing these issues to light. These include the Gates Foundation, Fuhrman and Elmore in *Redesigning Accountability Systems for Education*, and Dr. James Rosenbaum of Northwestern University author of the recent column, "It's Time to tell the Kids..." In Kentucky the P-16 council, in conjunction with the American Diploma Project, has been highly involved with this issue.

Kentucky's own data indicates high school achievement increases are far less substantial than elementary and middle schools. While accountability and assessment may have been a driving force at the two lower levels, most indicators suggest accountability has not been as powerful for high schools.

We suggest that improving high schools involves curriculum, instruction, organization structure, personnel and the senior year as much as assessment and accountability. SCAAC therefore recommends that the entire concept of the high school experience be transformed through a process to be devised and carried out by the Kentucky Department of Education. (We are aware there are currently "pilot projects" throughout the state but are concerned these efforts may not be spreading fast enough.)

In conjunction with this broad effort to improve high school learning, high school assessment should be re-examined as well. Since it appears that the current accountability and assessment system has had limited impact on high school student achievement, SCAAC recommends a thorough

review of assessment and accountability policies at the high school level including but not limited to such approaches as end-of-course exams, projects and independent study, and the realignment of standards, core content, program of studies and assessment.

Discussion was called for and there was none.

H.M. Snodgrass called for question. All in favor of the motion as read signified by answering “aye”. There was no opposition and the motion carried.

---

---

At 10:50 a.m. the committee began a morning break.

The meeting was reconvened at 11:09 a.m.

---

---

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>4. Writing Portfolio</b> | <b>Cherry Boyles<br/>and<br/>Saundra Hamon</b> |
|-----------------------------|--|

*SCAAC member comments:*

Benny Lile advised members that the Writing Portfolio agenda item had been moved to this time period to accommodate Kentucky Department of Education staff who had schedule conflicts.

Benny Lile spoke for Eleanor Mills as she has laryngitis. At the last meeting the committee reviewed a survey Eleanor and her sub-committee had developed. There was discussion on what needed to be done with the survey. During the time period Benny has had numerous discussions with a number of individuals. Benny Lile has also spoken with Starr Lewis. The consensus was that the survey was going to continue to define the issues and pretty much everyone knew what the issue was. We have done a wonderful job of defining what the issues, the problems and the concerns around the writing portfolio. In Eleanor’s words to think the efforts of the survey were for nothing were not. The survey got everyone to realize that there are issues with the writing portfolio. We’ve got issues and we need to start looking towards solutions.

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble introduced Cherry Boyles and outlined what Cherry and staff will speak about. We know we have issues so we should talk about what the writing curriculum is, what was the writing instructional process, what we hoped the writing assessment

would accomplish. The writing assessment consists of both the portfolio and the on-demand component. Cherry and staff have provided the committee with a particular set of research.

Cherry Boyles provided information on her background in the area of writing and introduced Sandra Hamon. The conversations that the writing consultants at the department have had over a period of years, classroom teachers have had, the members of our writing advisory committee, and our university writing project directors, are similar to the conversations that you are having. The most frustrating part is that solutions are not easy. We talk with teachers across the commonwealth and they tell us wonderful stories and we also talk with teachers who tell us stories that are not so wonderful.

The issues in Kentucky are similar to the issues in the nation. Although in Kentucky they look a bit different. The issue of greatest concern according to the neglected are from *The Need for Writing Revolution* which is a report of the National Commission on Writing for American Families, Schools and Colleges sponsored by the College Board. The key issues of writing instruction in the nation deal with the writing agenda which are issues in policy, federal leadership, and state and local leadership for writing instruction and assessment, teacher education programs, higher education control, resources teachers have. Secondly is student time spent on writing. The report recommends that students spend twice the amount of time on writing as they currently do. The third issue is measuring student results and it must be aligned to your standards and curriculum. They warn against only using multiple choice as way to measure student performance.

They talk about technologies and writing policies, teaching and learning, the time it takes and how you best incorporate technology in writing instruction. Lastly, how do you best provide professional development for teachers who need this. According to this study every teacher is responsible for it, not just distinguished teachers or teachers of language arts. It is all teachers because we write in all fields. The national panel says that teachers need professional development in writing. It needs to be good professional development, it needs to be effective, and it can be applied to the work that the teacher is doing. Much of the effort is now focused with English Language Learners.

Cherry then facilitated the committee through a series of questions that are centered around these issues. The committee discussed:

What does good writing instruction look like?

- Reflect on a time you have seen writing instruction do well?
- What strategies were used?
- How was the work accomplished?
- What was the goal?

What does writing instruction look like when it has not gone well?

How can assessment encourage good writing instruction?

How can assessment be tracked from good writing instruction?

Cherry provided committee members with a number of documents on writing. They included:

- Goals of Kentucky's Writing Assessment
- Saving Time with Writing Portfolios – An Idea Book for Administrators and Classroom Teachers, Kentucky Department of Education, September 1998
- A Checklist for Administrators – When Writing is Assigned, When Writing is Taught
- Guidelines for the Generation of Student Work for Writing Portfolios
- Program of Studies for Kentucky Schools, Writing Strands Primary-12, Kentucky Department of Education
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Results in Writing/ Writing Assessments administered by Grade Level
- Administrative Regulation 703 KAR 5:010 that deals with time
- Code of Ethics for Writing Portfolios

The committee then reviewed the contents of each of the documents.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland shared background information on that the original plan for writing was that it was tied to assessment and not to accountability.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney felt that these really were the goals of writing program and not assessment.

SCAAC member comments:

Varetta Hurt expressed the view that the writing portfolio is not necessarily the work of student. When she scores writing portfolio she does not know whose writing she is assessing. The ideas may be from the parent and you are not certain that it is the work of the student.

Henry Ormsby's definition of assessment is based on the decision between teacher and student. Accountability is someone else looking at it and scoring.

Benny Lile felt that accountability brings up the issues. With accountability do we have an independent piece of work, do we have an independent thinker, and do we have an independent writer. With accountability in the mix do we have true integration in performance assessment in the classroom, do we have a true documentation of students performance.

Maynard Thomas wanted to know when you throw accountability into the mix are you talking about teacher accountability or student accountability?

KDE staff comments:

Cherry shared a document that showed the accountability outcomes for the top 20 writing schools and bottom 20 writing schools. The analysis shows performance with the current weighting, if the weighting were changed where writing on-demand and the portfolio had equal weighing (50-50), the weighting is reversed (on-demand 80% and portfolio 20%), and on-demand is weighed 100%. There was no significant impact on the 2003 accountability index at the elementary school, middle school or high school levels. Currently the writing portfolio contributes 11% and on-demand writing 3% to the accountability index.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked KDE staff and committee members why in the top 20 schools there is such a significant drop in accountability index from the elementary schools to the high schools. The accountability index for top 20 elementary schools currently is 97.7, middle schools 85.1 and high schools 80.9. The bottom 20 schools do not have that shift. Bottom 20 elementary schools currently are at 59.1, middle schools 58.0 and high schools are 57.4.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles feels that there are a number of different reasons. With on-demand, students do not conference with their peers and they not get to conference with their teachers. In talking with elementary teachers, these students have not had much opportunity to do this on-demand type writing. Elementary students have to read the prompts, take it apart and understand the factors they are being asked to do. Students get a choice between two prompts. What we know at the elementary level is that typically students choose the first prompt. This happens also at the middle school and high school. We switched the order of one of the prompts in next years test and again students choose the first prompt. This seems to indicate that students do not spend much time on analyzing prompts.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile indicated that the fourth grades in his area have class sizes of 20 to 25 entries. At the middle and high we still have the language arts teachers responsible for 50 to 70 students at the middle school and 100 to 150 students at high school. Logic says that language arts teachers at the high school level have less time to conference and handle rewrites with their students than teachers at elementary schools. The on-demand will create a much more truer representation of what the child can actually do which gets reflected at the middle and high school level. Benny believes that is what the charts are communicating.

Benny Lile wanted to know if students could have more choice when responding to on-demand; not just limiting the choice to two prompts.

Kay Freeland asked how accurate is our assessment of the writing portfolio?

Suzanne Guyer shared the concern with so much adult conferencing happening at the elementary level she is concerned. Many elementary teachers have self contained classrooms and during the course of any given day as they get closer to portfolio deadlines they have a lot more flexibility in time that at the middle and high school. Elementary teachers are also pleasers. More time is spent on writing portfolio at the elementary school level.

KDE staff comments:

Cherry Boyles then addressed administrative regulations for the writing portfolio that deals with time and the code of ethics for writing portfolios.

SCAAC member comments:

Roxie Tempus advised that everyone knows requirements but they still violate them.

OEA staff comments:

Marcia Seiler asked about assessment violations. Are there cases where students have reviewed/ rewritten their portfolios 40 times reported as a violation?

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen indicated that to her knowledge we have never acted on an allegation from a parent on rewriting a portfolio 40 times. We do have a regulation that specifically speaks to that.

Cherry Boyles said that unless the writing staff see an allegation first hand they cannot report it. They do share the information with other people but it is the responsibility of the person seeing it first hand to report it.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland feels this is a reaction and we need to look at bigger picture on why is it being done. It's being done because of the over emphasis of accountability on portfolios. This is the one piece of accountability that teachers can control. She is not sure that the emphasis placed on the portfolios at the fourth grade is appropriate for students at that grade level.

Maynard Thomas asked if the portfolio could be used strictly for diagnostic purposes and the on-demand for accountability? If it could be done is the test more or less reliable?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that it could be done. There is a question of validity. What is more important, process or outcome. The Department has the data to do this technically and we could go back to 1998-99 through the current timeframe and drop the portfolio for calculations. It would change everybody's growth chart.

Cherry Boyles indicated that what will not be shown in the data is what will happen in the classroom if portfolios are removed from accountability. Where will we be because



the belief is that instruction will change. Committee members have shared what good writing is. When the classroom teacher is instructing students all goes together. Teachers are not going to break out on-demand from portfolios.

SCAAC member comments:

Roxie Tempus felt that if the portfolio were left out of accountability then we would see true student creative work coming through. Her opinion is that you would see improved on-demand writing scores and improved participation of students in the portfolio.

Benny Lile felt that for the good teacher there will not be a change in instruction. We are looking for some relief where it is not working for whatever reason it might be. Benny Lile has a stack of over 100 novice portfolios at the seventh grade. Something is not working and the teacher will tell you that the seventh grade curriculum is portfolios.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney looked at goals for the writing assessment and it does not address accountability. The Hamilton study from 1995 said that portfolios should be used in high stakes accountability.

SCAAC member comments:

Suzanne Guyer felt that with all the changes occurring NCLB etc. that a review of the overall weighting of writing should be reviewed. Everyone agrees that writing instruction is important. Writing needs to be intergraded into instruction at all grade levels, not just grades 4, 7 and 12.

## **SCAAC MOTION**

Eleanor Mills made the motion to adopt the motion for Portfolios as present in the document as presented on page 3. Kay Freeland seconded the motion. During discussion of the motion, members recommended exact word changes. Eleanor Mills then reintroduced the motion and Kay Freeland seconded the motion.  
The motion:

SCAAC recommends a thorough re-examination of the writing portfolio. We further recommend not including portfolio scores in the academic index while protecting the essential assessment of and emphasis on student writing skills through On Demand Writing. This review might also explore whether portfolios be changed to different grade levels and allow for a broader array of choices on behalf of students, both in terms of content and presentation. This might include, but not be limited to, technology, music, art, or vocational studies.

All members in favor of the motion as presented signified by saying aye (all members). All opposed say nay (none). The motion passed as presented.

---

---

At 12:51 p.m. the committee adjourned for lunch.

The meeting was reconvened at 1:50 p.m.

---

---

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reconvened the group and dealt with some house keeping items. Benny Lile advised that the Governor's staff are working on appointments. As soon as appointments are known we will communicate the information to committee members. Of the group that remains if we hear nothing it will be assumed that we will all show up May 21, 2004. Benny Lile polled members on their availability for a tentative May 21 meeting. There were two member no's but those recommend that the meeting proceed.

Benny Lile suggested that there be a joint meeting of the new and old committee. This will require old members to attend on their own time, at their own expense and have no official capacity. Benny Lile likes the concept and asked members if they had an interest in the joint meeting. Benny reminded members that not knowing when it might be; the meeting might be in May or June or even in September or October. Benny Lile did not hear dissension and there were nods in favor, so he will work towards a joint meeting.

Benny Lile also recommend that the committee meeting normally held in late August or September be placed on hold until information on appointments is better known.

No one on the committee disagreed.

Kay Freeland asked if the leadership structure was already set for the committee member transition. Is there a chair and co-chair/ vice-chair identified? Is it written anywhere?

Benny Lile responded that unless it is in the committee meeting minutes, he does not remember if the members voted on that.

Kay Freeland feels that it would be wise to have two co-chairs and one of the co-chairs would be a person that has some longevity with the committee. Both Benny Lile and Maynard Thomas could be gone from this committee and we could facing the situation with no leadership. There should be some continuity.

Benny Lile agreed and he indicated to the best of his knowledge appointed councils like this have no bi-laws. At the first meeting the group voted to have a chair and vice-chair and then elected those individuals at that time.

Robert Sexton asked members who have history with this committee, KDE staff and LRC staff to confirm that bi-laws do not exist.

Benny Lile and others said the entire structure came out of House Bill 53 (1998). If this council would like to have a second vice-chair with the stipulation that it is the pleasure of this group.

Kay Freeland said that with the possibility of seven people not returning and three open appointments, there needs to be some kind of leadership still available.

Roxie Tempus felt that it would be difficult to name a chair as it is not clear who will be reappointed.

Because of the number of unknowns, the committee took no action on appointing a vice-chair.

## **5. Curriculum Coverage and Number of Test Forms**

**Scott Trimble  
and  
Benny Lile**

### SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile said at our last meeting a lot of positives came out. One was the broad coverage that we test with the Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) and what it does for our state curriculum. One of the issues that comes about that NTAPAA member(s) commented that there should be turnover in test forms. What is concerning Benny Lile is that we have approximately 80% of the test re-given every year. Are we getting items that become very familiar in the test setting? With the number of forms, only a limited number of students are going to have them.

### KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that we have looked at items that are repeated on the assessment and how they change over time. We looked at the open response items and have only seen a shift of .1 or .2 on a scale of 4. The question is, can we reduce the number of forms that we administer without changing the core content? The answer is that we probably could reduce the number some but not much. The reason is that two-thirds of the sum of the score comes from open response items. We are covering the entire core content in 30 open response items. If we begin to reduce forms we begin to reduce content coverage. Open response items are functionally different than multiple choice items. The open response items provide better information about students scoring at the upper end of the distribution. They also give us more information about the students scoring at the lower end of the distribution. Multiple choice items tend to function somewhere in the middle.

### SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile confirmed with Scott Trimble that looking at the data from the items that get used over multiple years are not showing a higher score that would lead one to believe that there is not inappropriate use of the open response items.

Suzanne Guyer had an observation that with teacher scoring, it might then take on a little different profile.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that other states typically administer one form of the test. We contacted states that said they had five and six forms and found that they created multiple forms field test items. There was really one form of the live items. That certainly is a choice that we could make. They then release the form they used and then go to a completely new form the next year. There are statistical ways that this can be made to happen. One of the tradeoffs is that we would have to stabilize how the six open response items are distributed across the content area. The technical panel will have to weigh in on whether the trends we currently have could continue.

SCAAC member comments:

Committee members discussed a couple of different configurations including rotating items every four years and in the main content areas releasing two items every year.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reminded members that under the current model of six forms, one form is designed for visually impaired, one is for hearing impaired and one is the linking form. We will need to compensate for this in any new model.

Scott returned to the NTAPAA discussion on the curriculum being a mile wide and inch deep. European countries focus on a narrower curriculum. If we taught a narrower curriculum, we would be able to measure it and it would better lend to fewer forms.

SCAAC member comments:

The committee then revisited the writing assessment discussion from the morning session.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France shared with the committee a revised chart showing how schools would perform if only the on-demand writing scores were included in the academic index. At the elementary level the writing top 20 schools move from the current overall academic index of 97.7 to 93.2. The bottom 20 writing elementary schools would virtually stay about the same, 59.1 to 58.3. The same was done for the middle school and high school. At the middle school the top 20 middle schools went from 85.1 to 83.6 while lowest 20 middle schools went from 58.0 to 60.2. The top 20 writing high schools went from 80.9 to 79.3 while the lowest 20 writing high schools went from 57.4 to 57.6. This is making a lot of assumptions about what would continue in instruction and presentation.

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 5a. | <b>Informational Update on April 2004 KBE Action regarding Assessment &amp; Accountability Issues - 703 KAR 5:040</b> | <b>Scott Trimble<br/>and<br/>Cindy Owen</b> |
|-----|---|---|

*KDE staff comments:*

Cindy Owen presented an update on regulation 703 KAR 5:040: Accountability for Commonwealth Accountability Testing System Performance for Students Attending A3, A5, & A6 Schools. The committee has seen the regulation at a number of previous meetings as it has moved forward through the revision process. Since the last time the committee saw the regulation, we have added that in order for an A3, A5, or A6 program to be treated like an A1 school, the district would have to request that. Language about A4 schools has been clarified that with the non-academic data that the same collection procedures would apply. An A4 school is a pre-school and none of that data goes into any schools index. Any time there is a reference to a self-placed student, language is being modified to say that they qualify for the program that they are trying to enroll in. The revised regulation will go to the State Board in June for final approval.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Benny Lile felt that these are minor changes and clarifications and that the committee need not take any action. Other committee members agreed.

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 5b. | <b>Informational Update on April 2004 KBE Action regarding Assessment &amp; Accountability Issues - Reward Strategies</b> | <b>Scott Trimble<br/>and<br/>Cindy Owen</b> |
|-----|---|---|

*KDE staff comments:*

Cindy Owen presented information on reward strategies. Since there is no reward money this will not be a real long conversation. Language has been left in the regulations with the hope that in the future the legislature will replace the money. The discussion will be centered around what we can do instead of providing money. People really liked the flags that were done before so the thought is that we will continue with that practice. We have talked about having the Commissioner travel to schools that would have received reward money. Perhaps we could do a regional celebration. There will be something along those lines that will be done.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Suzanne Guyer asked who will make the decision. Is this a Kentucky Department of Education decision?

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen responded that this will be a State Board decision. A staff note was presented to State Board at their last meeting.

|            |   |                                     |
|------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>5c.</b> | <b>Informational Update on April 2004 KBE Action regarding Assessment &amp; Accountability Issues - Reward Strategies</b> | <b>Scott Trimble and Cindy Owen</b> |
|------------|---|-------------------------------------|

KDE staff comments:

Longitudinal assessments

Scott Trimble talked about longitudinal assessments, which are required by House Bill 53. We pointed out in staff note to the Board that we had started a longitudinal pilot and it was ready to go forward with reading grade 4 and grade 5 longitudinal assessment. We stopped that when the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was passed. NCLB required testing of reading and mathematics at grades 3 through 8. We intend to replace the longitudinal assessment with the NCLB required testing which will be implemented in Spring 2006 testing. We will have augmented NRT in reading at grades end-of-primary (3), 5, 6, 8 and augmented mathematics NRT at grades end-of-primary (3), 4, 6, and 7.

The basic thrust of the discussion is that the Board will have to make some decisions when we get closer to 2006 as to how the longitudinal data fed into the accountability system. There are at least two kinds of options. One is to formally make it part of the accountability index calculation. This probably would require us to re-establish the baselines. It would change the index sufficiently where it would be difficult to think of schools being on the same trend lines as we started in 1999-2000.

The other option is that some sort of longitudinal statistic would trigger additional rewards or assistance. NTAPAA still believes that it would be wise to make those kinds of decisions after a year or two of data so that the longitudinal impact could be modeled in different ways. The longitudinal reporting will begin in 2007.

The other big policy issue the Board has to address, and this committee will have to think about as well, is that we agreed that we would weight the open response items in reading and mathematics two-thirds (2/3) of the score and the multiple choice one-third (1/3) of the score. When we look at how the augmented NRT will be built, it will be impossible to keep the same distribution of open response/ multiple choice items. In rough terms the multiple choice make up of augmented NRT will be about 70 items. The open response make up in both areas will be an additional two open response

items. This will make it difficult to continue the 1/3 2/3 weighting of multiple choice and open response.

Linda France had a question for the committee. When talking about longitudinal assessment, Is the interest more in following groups of students through the system or individuals through the system. We will have unique student identifiers in place, up and running, hopefully by October 2004. We actually will have them in May, but because of training issues, we will not actually start to use them at school level until October. One can see how that factors into tracking individuals across time.

The discussions Linda France has had with superintendents and principals have been around the issue of value added. Where were the students in the third grade and how have you progressed as you have gone through the system.

SCAAC member comments:

H.M. Snodgrass felt that another element is the validity of individual student data in making decisions.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney pointed out that because of time lag between the current assessments, between grade 4 and grade 7, the tests are designed in a certain manner. Because there will be tests at every grade between grades 3 and 8, will we change the nature of tests?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that his hope is that through 2006 we will not change the nature of test. Possibly core content at the current off grades will be established as a necessary condition.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton advised that once we have individual student numbers not only we track student performance we can look at individuals teacher performance.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble said that it would require capture of teacher tracking data that is currently not done. Also, we currently do not have a vertically equated reporting scale.

Linda France said that the Department is working on matching course titles as course descriptions across the state are very different. Without course categorization this is creating a lot of problems at the state level when evaluating the success of different curriculum, courses and programs.

If we develop end of course assessments this will assist in the standardizing of courses.

**Discussion on April 2004 KBE Actions Regarding  
Assessment & Accountability Issues**

**Scott Trimble**

**8b. End-of-Course Exams**

**8c. Snapshot Assessments**

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble started the discussion by saying that in the future accountability might be different at the grade levels of elementary, middle, and high school. There are end-of-course assessment possibilities at the high school. The ACT test could play a role. The core content may be redefined to match some subset.

What should the role of snapshot assessments be. Should it be a diagnostic tool that is administered once, twice a year? Will this be teacher's discretion? Who will define it, the teacher, the state, the district, the school?

*SCAAC member comments:*

Roxie Tempus asked for a definition of snapshot assessments in the context that the committee is being asked to comment on. She is not familiar with the term.

*KDE staff comments:*

Linda France responded that we have begun to refer to this type of diagnostic test as a snapshot assessment as how the student is doing at this point in time. We could call it formative assessment which may be a better descriptor. If we are working toward this proficiency standard in the first nine weeks or first semester we administer a formative assessment. From that we ought to be able to inform our instruction, what do we need to remediate, what do we need to further develop, where is the student on the pathway to proficiency in this core content or this course.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Benny Lile added that the question is should snapshot be developed to be used statewide? What is the purpose or result? If we can do this statewide, which is a resource issue, then certainly it can be made part of assessment but does it need to be part of accountability? Benny Lile feels that it should only be part of assessment as it is a resource for teachers which helps aid and abet assessment.

H. M. Snodgrass agreed snapshot assessments should not be part of accountability component. As envisioned by Commissioner Wihoit and Linda France, school districts will be able to download and administer a pool of items or a pool of tests. These will be spot checks along the way during the year. If you want to be most productive and get a positive response and be very supportive of school districts and teachers, that is the route you would go. You would put a hammer over their head if you said this was another element of accountability or another element of the state assessment.

*KDE staff comments:*



Linda France indicated that it currently is going on in some districts. For example Anderson County has a fourth grade mathematics assessment that has a bank of math items.

The Department is currently working on twelve (12) curriculum maps that will be posted on the WEB site by June. The idea is that from those curriculum maps then the Department would offer a bank of assessment items that would be connected to either a unit of study or that curriculum map. The Department would not create the items, we would actually turn to districts that already have been creating, try to correct them and have the kind of jurying process so that if it is placed on the WEB, a group of experts or a group of teachers that would agree to serve as experts in their content area could put their stamp of approval on the items.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Benny Lile asked if there had been a discussion on what grade levels will be developed. Will it be grades K-12 or grades 3-8?

*KDE staff comments:*

Linda France responded that grades 3 through 12 in reading and mathematics are the first priority. Next year or the next go around science grades 3 through 12 and social studies grades 3 through 12 are the content areas of choice. The Department is working with the University of Kentucky out of the Appalachian Math and Science project. We want to partner with them as they have the technical capacity and already have the development work done.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Benny Lile advised members that there was no longer a committee member quorum (2:54 p.m.), and while discussions could proceed, members could not vote nor propose committee motions.

Benny Lile asked members if there were any more questions on snapshot assessments and there no response from the committee. Benny Lile felt that the members had discussed end-of-course in the morning session.

Robert Sexton asked the question on what was being proposed on the end of course exams.

*KDE staff comments:*

Linda answered that it was still being developed. The Department brought a group of college deans and university deans together to discuss this concept and there is always a debate about what you are going to do with the grade. If we propose or offer end-of-course exams and teachers give them, what will they do with the results? With our current system in place, our current credit system, you may move through Kentucky high schools, earn credit with a "D" minus, and that grade suggests that it would prepare the student for very little. It will allow you to earn a high school diploma. We are hoping to eventually head down a road where we judge proficiency a little more rigorously. The

high school diploma in Kentucky actually means that you have the proficiency in the core content, at least a 70% proficiency. We are not talking about watered down curriculum. That debate is taking place right now. We don't have all of the answers at this time. Those discussions will start at the Board meeting in June.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton feels it is critical to align high school and college/university curriculums.

KDE staff comments:

Linda France wanted to get back to the question raised on the roll of technology. Linda France feels that technology will play a major role. That is why we are so happy to be talking with the University of Kentucky as one of our possible partners. We want to be able to deliver curriculum, deliver remediation, deliver rigorous course work through technology and not having a certified teacher or not having the course available at the school should not be a barrier to those students. Geography should not be a barrier. We are looking to technology to play a stronger role in helping deliver some of these curriculums.

Linda France feels that there is a lot of benefit to provide immediate feedback on how well students did on assessments, both from the teachers point of view and the students point of view. We know the online assessments in that regard is a major advancement.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby feels that teachers are key to everything we have been talking about. Longer term Henry has heard that 30 percent of teachers are eligible to retire and we will need to replace them. Is there a group that looking strategically at how we are going to attract, develop, and retain the next generation of teachers?

KDE staff comments:

Linda France advised the Department has a Division of Teacher Recruitment and we are working closely with universities. We are beginning to develop future teacher clubs in high school.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked members if they had any other issues to raise.

Robert Sexton wanted to thank Benny Lile for his dedicated service to this committee. This was assuming that appointments would occur momentarily.

Benny Lile wanted to go on the record for an item that he has never brought out at the meeting. He has had a concern for some time that. Last night Benny facilitated a regional school board training session. During one of the breaks two board members were talking about the testing environment. Benny's concern is the integrity of our testing environment and the poster issue. The comment from one board member was that he was at one his elementary schools yesterday and all the children have to do is look up at the wall and they can answer every question. True or not, that is the

perception. The other board member said that he/she guess that is the way we have to play the game. Originally everything on classroom walls was covered over. Then the Department said you didn't have to do that because they didn't want people to go through the all the hassle of doing all of that. Benny does that anyway in his district. His teachers have challenged him on this and when he asks them why and when they cannot answer him he becomes real worried. Benny feels that this committee, down the line, needs to look at this.

Roxie Tempus indicated that this has also been a concern of hers. She puts it back in the no one can do anything about it because KDE has approved. She has seen posters put up and the understanding is that as long as it has been up so many weeks that it can stay. That means the testing environment that she was in there was very little creativity on the walls because all year long the testing posters, so they could legally stay up during testing. It is not just Benny and it is not just a couple counties away, it is very much alive and well. They feel that KDE has sanctioned that and they feel very ok about it. Roxie sited some examples where they switched high end students from one room to another base on which test they were taking. Coincidentally the walls had posters relevant to the content area the students were being tested in

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble spoke to the reason of why we are where we are. Benny Lile is quite right that we have had this debate of having to sanitize the room before you test or not. The position the Department took is that people are expected to use the walls that are consistent with the instructional program. Nor do we condone anyone putting materials up for the purpose of testing, nor did we want for the teacher to have to clean the room out just because of testing. We wanted it to be seamless in that sense. When we rewrite the administrative code or code of ethics, we may take that approach that was recommended back then. Again we do not condone or permit putting up materials on the wall for the purpose of testing. What we thought we were doing was leaving the walls for the use of instruction

Cindy Owen said that this issue gets stronger every year and doesn't diminish or die. Based on the calls and comments we receive, there appears to be advantages to some children and other students are disadvantaged. If we open up the administration code, we need to come back to this committee and others and we should consider it and just tell them to take them down.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Roxie Tempus wanted to share that when she first came on this committee, she was not sure that the Department really listened to what we had to say. They would listen but you would kind of oh yea, right and that is just their opinion. The longer I have been on the committee I can really say that getting to know all of the different people from the Department that feel I like you do value what we say and we now you are accepting also that it just not a small isolated incident. That we have built up our credibility and you are listening that these things are really going on in a wider area than what the Department would like to hear. I admire how when you say something in the community

that might make you uncomfortable and that you do not like, you do not put us down. She is very appreciative and proud to be part of this committee and had the opportunity to interact for better education in Kentucky.

Benny Lile thanked Roxie for her comments. We are an advisor board and we planned our expertise and he has always felt each and everything we have touched has been given due consideration. Sometimes it works out and sometimes it doesn't.

|                    |
|--------------------|
| <b>ADJOURNMENT</b> |
|--------------------|

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that since there no longer a member quorum, there could not be a motion to adjourn the meeting. Benny Lile ended the meeting at 3:23 p.m.